



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,750	09/22/2003	David J. Lillie	03SW198/ALBRP318US	1899
7590	05/07/2010		EXAMINER	
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation 704-P, IP Department 1201 South 2nd Street Milwaukee, WI 53204			STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	
			05/07/2010	DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,750	LILLIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRENT STACE	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/23/09 and 3/18/10</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed February 4th, 2010. Claims 1-39 are pending. In the amendment filed February 4th, 2010, Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 21, 26, and 33-39 are amended, and Claims 1, 12, 21, 26, 33, and 34 are independent.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/4/10 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. The Applicant's arguments filed February 4th, 2010 with respect to Claims 1-39 have been considered but are not moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See below.

Response to Amendment

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 11/23/09 and 3/18/10 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Specification

5. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

6. In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the previous drawing objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.

7. Since the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the drawings. For example, the drawings should be carefully checked to ensure that all reference numerals are described in the specification, that no one reference numeral describes two separate drawing elements, or that the specification contains no reference to numerals not in the drawings.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Claim 1 has shared access profiles being associated with role-specific sets lines 5-6 and within them in line 15-16. Claim 1 also has a concept of a user profile. Clarity of the claim could be greatly enhanced if 1) a layout of relationships or architecture between the shared access profile, user roles, role-specific sets, components, and user profiles was defined and 2) the relationship between a shared access profile and user profile was defined.
- Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 12-17, 19-22, 24, 26-31, 34, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034799 (Mikami).

Claim 12 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “A system that provides access to components on a network, [Mikami, paragraph [0006]] comprising:

- a loading component that launches a shared portal configuration that provides of customized access to the components via a portal based on a user role associated with the shared portal configuration; [Mikami, paragraphs [0029] with [0036] with [0049]-[0050], web page loaded based on merged/shared user profiles. Components being properties/attributes of portlets] and
- one or more portlets that are respectively associated with the components, [Mikami, paragraphs [0029]-[0030] with [0049]-[0050], portal applications in Mikami are known as portlets to one of ordinary skill in the art. Components being properties/attributes of portlets] the portlets reside within the portal [Mikami, Fig. 3] and provide access to the respective components in accordance with the shared portal configuration; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], access granted from shared parent profile]
- wherein the portal configuration presents a subset of the components associated with the user role and allows a selected component from the subset to be associated with a portlet from the one or more portlets" [Mikami, paragraph [0036], web page loaded based on merged/shared user profiles].

Claim 13 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: "The system of claim 12, wherein multiple instances of the shared portal configuration are concurrently utilized by multiple users associated with the user role" [Mikami, paragraphs [0037] with [0036], child users create instances of the at least one shared profile (e.g. 2 children (B and C) having the same parent (A))].

Claim 14 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The system of claim 12, further comprising a utility to modify and save the shared portal configuration” [Mikami, paragraph [0029], profile information created and recorded].

Claim 15 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The system of claim 14, the utility defines an attribute for the shared portal configuration comprising one of a hide or a share attribute” [Mikami, paragraph [0066], hide application data from child user].

Claim 16 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The system of claim 12, further comprising intelligence to automatically select and load the shared portal configuration” [Mikami, paragraph [0036], web page loaded based on merged/shared user profiles].

Claim 17 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The system of claim 16, the intelligence utilizes at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference or a classifier to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration for the user” [Mikami, paragraph [0044], users classified as parents to a user (e.g. user C)].

Claim 19 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The system of claim 13, at least one of the multiple instances of the shared portal configuration is dynamically refreshed in response to a modification to the shared portal configuration” [Mikami, paragraph [0087], modifying settings for applications stored in profile storage].

Claim 20 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The system of claim 12, the portal is a graphical user interface including one of a web browser, a web page or a home page” [Mikami, paragraph [0030] with Fig. 3].

Claim 21 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “A method for employing a shared portal configuration, [Mikami, paragraph [0029]] comprising:

- selecting a shared portal configuration associated with a user role; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], web page loaded based on merged/shared user profiles]
- loading a portal configuration according to the shared portal configuration to instantiate one or more portlets within the portal; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], web page loaded based on merged/shared user profiles with Mikami, Fig. 3]
- instantiating one or more portlets within the portal; [Mikami, Fig. 3]
- providing a list of networked components associated with the user role, the list comprising a subset of a total number of available networked components; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], related attributes (only granted ones is a subset) with Mikami, paragraphs [0029]-[0030] portal applications in Mikami are known as portlets to one of ordinary skill in the art]
- receiving an input that associates the one or more portlets with respective networked components selected from the list to provide selective access to the respective networked components via the one or more portals; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], related attributes merged into profile and used to select portal applications to be read for the portal page] and
- employing the one or more portlets to access the networked components associated with the one or more portlets" [Mikami, paragraph [0036], web applications on portal with Mikami, Fig. 3].

Claim 22 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: "The method of claim 21, the shared portal configuration selected from a set of shared configurations that are

associated with the user role" [Mikami, paragraph [0036], parent(s) profile used in child profile creation].

Claim 24 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: "The system of claim 21, further comprising employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inferences or a classifier to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration" [Mikami, paragraph [0044], users classified as parents to a user (e.g. user C)].

Claim 26 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: "A method for customizing and saving a shared portal configuration, [Mikami, paragraph [0029]] comprising:

- logging on to a portal under a user role; [Mikami, paragraph [0032], authorization with Mikami, paragraph [0051], parent or child role]
- initializing a portal configuration associated with the user role that utilizes one or more portlets to provide selective access to network components; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], merge profile(s) and put up the associated portlets]
- filtering a list of total available networked components based on the user role to yield a role-specific list of networked components; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], only parentally allowed related attributes are merged with child profile]
- providing the role-specific list of networked components associated with a user role; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], child role is based on basic and related attributes]
- receiving user input to customize the portal configuration by associating selected networked components from the role-specific list with the one or more portlets to

yield a customized portal configuration; [Mikami, paragraphs [0036] with [0065] with [0068], parents or children can customize configuration]

- defining the customized portal configuration as a shared configuration to be used in connection with user profiles associated with the user role; [Mikami, paragraph [0029], assigning permission to parent profile for sharing] and
- saving the portal configuration” [Mikami, paragraph [0029], profiles are recorded].

Claim 27 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The method of claim 26, wherein initializing the portal configuration comprises initializing an existing configuration or a new configuration” [Mikami, paragraph [0036], child configuration made from basic and related attributes].

Claim 28 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The method of claim 26, further comprising customizing the portal configuration by at least one of adding, removing or editing portlets” [Mikami, paragraph [0064], only permitted applications are added and/or permitted for editing].

Claim 29 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The method of claim 26, further comprising customizing the configuration by defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location or opacity” [Mikami, paragraph [0073], portal application disappears].

Claim 30 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The method of claim 26, further comprising customizing the configuration by associating networked components with the portlets” [Mikami, paragraphs [0036] with [0065] with [0068], parents or children can customize configuration].

Claim 31 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The method of claim 26, wherein saving the portal configuration comprises saving the shared configuration to at least one of a storage location local to the portal, a common storage location on the network or a storage location associated with another portal” [Mikami, paragraph [0029], storage device of a portal server].

Claim 34 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “An application programmer interface (API) [Mikami, paragraph [0015]] that generates a shared portal configuration in a computer readable medium, [Mikami, paragraph [0029], record parental profile on storage device of a server] comprising:

- instructions for instantiating a portal configuration; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], merge profile(s) and put up the associated portlets]
- instructions for filtering a list of available networked components based on a user role to yield a role-specific list of networked components; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], only parentally allowed related attributes are merged with child profile]
- instructions for receiving an input to associate selected networked components from the role-specific list with selected portlets within the portal configuration; [Mikami, paragraphs [0036] with [0065] with [0068], parents or children can customize configuration]
- instructions for defining the portal configuration to provide customized access to the selected networked components via the portlets; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], related attributes merged into child profile and only allowed components (customized) are used with allowed portlets]

- instructions for associating the portal configuration with a selected user role; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], merged basic + related attributes from parents to children] and
- instructions for saving the portal configuration as a shared configuration accessible by logging on under the selected user role” [Mikami, paragraph [0029], profiles are recorded as parental profiles with Mikami, paragraph [0032] that must be logged in to].

Claim 36 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for associating one or more of a read, a write or an execute attribute with the portal configuration” [Mikami, paragraph [0064], parents grant children permission to execute certain portal applications].

Claim 37 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for adding, removing, and editing a portlet associated with the portal” [Mikami, paragraph [0068], children can edit data of a portlet for different use conditions].

Claim 38 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The API of claim 37, further comprising instructions for associating a networked component with the portlet” [Mikami, paragraphs [0036] and [0065], data components associated with different portlet applications].

Claim 39 can be mapped to Mikami as follows: “The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location or opacity” [Mikami, paragraph [0073], portal application disappears].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034799 (Mikami) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0117437 (Cook et al.).

For **Claim 1**, Mikami teaches: “A system that employs a shared access profile to interact with at least one networked device, [Mikami, paragraph [0029], sharing all or portion(s) of profile with another user] comprising:

- a storage component that is utilized to store one or more shared access profiles [Mikami, paragraph [0061], profile storage 550] respectively customized to provide access to the at least one networked device, [Mikami, paragraph [0045], custom constructed with Mikami, paragraphs [0005]-[0006], note that portal applications are web applications, and using one provides access to the networked device supporting the portal application] the one or more shared access profiles associated with respective user roles, [Mikami, paragraph [0051] with [0036], parental profiles associated with parental role] and the user roles having respective role-specific sets [Mikami, paragraph [0051] with [0036], parental roles part of parental role set, children roles part of children set] of one or more user profiles associated therewith; [Mikami, paragraph [0051] with [0036], profiles associated with users]
- a retrieval component that obtains a selected shared access profile from the one or more shared access profiles saved on the storage component; [Mikami, paragraph [0061], user profile reader]
- a user interface that employs the selected shared access profile to provide selective access to the at least one networked device based on the user role associated with the selected shared access profile; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], only parents control child access and display constructed accordingly] and
- ...the limited administrator privileges granting the selected user profiles an ability to create, modify, and remove shared access profiles within their respective role-specific sets" [Mikami, paragraph [0029], selected administrators granting

parental profiles permissions to share profile (this at least creates a shared access profile). The examiner notes that only one ability is required by the claim].

Mikami discloses the above limitations but does not explicitly teach:

- “...an administrative component that allows limited administrator privileges to be delineated to selected user profiles within the role-specific sets.”

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Cook, teaches:

- “...an administrative component that allows limited administrator privileges to be delineated to selected user profiles within the role-specific sets” [Cook, paragraphs [0051]-[0058], create group admins (GAs)].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Cook and Mikami before him/her to combine Cook with Mikami because the inventions are directed towards administrators for portals.

Cook’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami’s invention because the inventions use administrators for portals. Mikami discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising sharing parental profiles with children profiles where the sharing is enabled by an administrator. However, Mikami does not expressly disclose that a selected user profile can be delineated limited admin rights. Cook discloses a portal administration tool (title) comprising granting limited admin rights to certain user(s).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Cook and Mikami before him/her to take the granting limited admin rights to certain user(s) from Cook and install it into the teachings of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of distributed portal administration to handle complex portals with a large number of users (Cook, paragraph [0004]).

Claim 2 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, the respective one or more shared access profiles further associated with a location, and the retrieval component obtains the selected shared access profile in accordance with a user’s role and current location” [Mikami, paragraph [0049], local weather with Mikami, paragraph [0054], at least initial settings from parent].

Claim 3 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, the shared access profile is one of a default or a user customized profile” [Mikami, paragraph [0029], parental profile is user customized (e.g. via attributes)].

Claim 4 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, the at least one shared access profile is associated with one or more attributes comprising at least one of a read, a write or an execute attribute” [Mikami, paragraph [0036], selects portal applications to read according to merged profile (basic+related attributes)].

Claim 7 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, the at least one shared access profile is automatically updated in the

user interface in response to a modification to the at least one shared access profile” [Mikami, paragraph [0087], modifying settings for applications stored in profile storage].

Claim 9 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, multiple instances of the at least one shared access profile are instantiated by a plurality of users with the similar role within a plurality of user interfaces” [Mikami, paragraphs [0037] with [0036], child users create instances of the at least one shared profile (e.g. 2 children (B and C) having the same parent (A))].

Claim 10 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, the user interface is a portal with one or more portlets” [Mikami, paragraphs [0029]-[0030], portal applications in Mikami are known as portlets to one of ordinary skill in the art].

Claim 11 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook) as follows: “The system of claim 1, employed in an industrial environment” [Cook, paragraph [0097], software development is an industrial environment].

For **Claim 33**, Mikami teaches: “A system for employing a shared portal configuration to access components on a network, [Mikami, paragraph [0029], sharing all or portion(s) of profile with another user] comprising:

- means for selecting a shared portal configuration providing customized access to the components from one or more configurations associated with a user role; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], parental profile selected that provides access to attributes/portlets]

- means for invoking the shared portal configuration, the invocation instantiating portlets [Mikami, paragraph [0036], parental profile used/invoked to determine portlets available to child with Mikami, paragraphs [0029]-[0030], portal applications in Mikami are known as portlets to one of ordinary skill in the art] and respectively associating selected networked components with the portlets; [Mikami, paragraph [0036], basic + related attributes used in determining necessary/permitted portlets]
- means for employing the portlets to access the networked components, the networked components associated with the user role; [Mikami, paragraphs [0036] with [0068], components used as data for applications] and
- ... the limited administrator privileges granting the selected user profiles an ability to create, modify, and remove shared portal configurations associated with the user role" [Mikami, paragraph [0029], selected administrators granting parental profiles permissions to share profile (this at least creates a shared access profile). The examiner notes that only one ability is required by the claim].

Mikami discloses the above limitations but does not explicitly teach:

- "...means for delineating limited administrative privileges to selected user profiles associated with the user role, ... without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove shared portal configurations associated with a disparate user role."

With respect to Claim 33, an analogous art, Cook, teaches:

- "...means for delineating limited administrative privileges to selected user profiles associated with the user role, [Cook, paragraphs [0051]-[0058], create group

admins (GAs)] ... without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove shared portal configurations associated with a disparate user role" [Cook, paragraphs [0059]-[0067], GAs only have admin privileges for a group. Privileges such as remove/delete and create].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Cook and Mikami before him/her to combine Cook with Mikami because the inventions are directed towards administrators for portals.

Cook's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami's invention because the inventions use administrators for portals. Mikami discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising sharing parental profiles with children profiles where the sharing is enabled by an administrator. However, Mikami does not expressly disclose that a selected user profile can be delineated limited admin rights without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove shared portal configurations associated with a disparate user role. Cook discloses a portal administration tool (title) comprising granting limited admin rights to certain user(s) where those admin rights have limited jurisdiction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Cook and Mikami before him/her to take the granting limited admin rights to certain user(s) from Cook and install it into the teachings of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of distributed portal administration to handle complex portals with a large number of users (Cook, paragraph [0004]).

For **Claim 35**, Mikami teaches: “The API of claim 34, further comprising...the limited administrative privileges granting an ability to create, modify and remove portal configurations associated with the user role” [Mikami, paragraph [0029], selected administrators granting parental profiles permissions to share profile (this at least creates a shared access profile). The examiner notes that only one ability is required by the claim].

Mikami discloses the above limitations but does not explicitly teach:

- “...instructions for delineating limited administrative privileges to selected user profiles associated with the user role, ... without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove portal configurations associated with a disparate user role.”

With respect to Claim 35, an analogous art, Cook, teaches:

- “...instructions for delineating limited administrative privileges to selected user profiles associated with the user role, [Cook, paragraphs [0051]-[0058], create group admins (GAs)]... without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove portal configurations associated with a disparate user role” [Cook, paragraphs [0059]-[0067], GAs only have admin privileges for a group. Privileges such as remove/delete and create].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Cook and Mikami before him/her to combine Cook with Mikami because the inventions are directed towards administrators for portals.

Cook’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami’s invention because the inventions use administrators for portals. Mikami

discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising sharing parental profiles with children profiles where the sharing is enabled by an administrator. However, Mikami does not expressly disclose that a selected user profile can be delineated limited admin rights without granting an ability to create, modify, or remove shared portal configurations associated with a disparate user role. Cook discloses a portal administration tool (title) comprising granting limited admin rights to certain user(s) where those admin rights have limited jurisdiction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Cook and Mikami before him/her to take the granting limited admin rights to certain user(s) from Cook and install it into the teachings of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of distributed portal administration to handle complex portals with a large number of users (Cook, paragraph [0004]).

14. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034799 (Mikami) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0117437 (Cook et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,007 (Nielsen).

For **Claim 5**, Mikami (as modified by Cook) teaches: “The system of claim 1, further comprising.”

Mikami (as modified by Cook) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: “...an update component that provides a notification to the user interface when the at least one shared access profile is modified and refreshes the user interface in accordance with the changed at least one shared access profile upon a user approval.”

With respect to Claim 5, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: “...an update component that provides a notification ... when the at least one shared access profile is modified and refreshes the user interface in accordance with the changed at least one shared access profile upon a user approval” [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

With respect to Claim 5, an analogous art, Nielsen, teaches: “...to the user interface” [Nielsen, col. 10, lines 45-55].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Mikami (as modified by Cook) because both inventions are directed towards profiles and online applications.

Hayes Jr.’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami (as modified by Cook)’s invention because both inventions use profiles and online applications. Mikami (as modified by Cook) discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising parent and child profiles with delegation of administrative privileges. However Mikami (as modified by Cook) does not expressly disclose notification of a changed to the shared access profile with automatic refreshing. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access

permissions comprising notification and allowing automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification and allowance of automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Mikami (as modified by Cook), thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views (Hayes, paragraph [0062]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Nielsen with Mikami (as modified by Cook and Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards user notification.

Nielsen's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami (as modified by Cook and Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use notifications. Mikami (as modified by Cook and Hayes Jr.) discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising parent and child profiles with delegation of administrative privileges. However Mikami (as modified by Cook and Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose a text or audio notification. Nielsen discloses automatic updates of bookmarks in a client computer comprising dialog notification/indication to a user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification technique from Nielsen and install it into the invention of Mikami (as modified by Cook and Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage

of user notification and allowing the refresh to occur after the dialog notification (dialog modality).

Claim 6 can be mapped to Mikami (as modified by Cook, Hayes, and Nielsen) as follows: “The system of claim 5, the notification comprising at least one of a text message or an audio message” [Nielsen, col. 10, lines 45-55].

15. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034799 (Mikami) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0117437 (Cook et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087525 (Abbott et al.).

For **Claim 8**, Mikami (as modified by Cook) teaches: “The system of claim 1.” Mikami (as modified by Cook) discloses the above limitations but does not explicitly teach: “...multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated within the user interface wherein the user can toggle between the multiple instances or partition the user interface to concurrently view more than one instance.”

With respect to Claim 8, an analogous art, Abbott, teaches: “...multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated within the user interface wherein the user can toggle between the multiple instances or partition the user interface to concurrently view more than one instance” [Abbott, paragraphs [0054]-[0055]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Abbott and Mikami (as modified by Cook) before

him/her to combine Abbott with Mikami (as modified by Cook) because the inventions are directed towards user profiles.

Abbott's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami (as modified by Cook)'s invention because the inventions use user profiles. Mikami (as modified by Cook) discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising parent and child profiles with delegation of administrative privileges. However, Mikami (as modified by Cook) does not expressly disclose multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated within the user interface wherein the user can toggle between the multiple instances or partition the user interface to concurrently view more than one instance. Abbott discloses soliciting information based on a computer user's context (title) comprising multiple instances of a profile where the user can toggles between them.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Abbott and Mikami (as modified by Cook) before him/her to take the toggling of active PICs from Abbott and install it into the teachings of Mikami (as modified by Cook), thereby offering the obvious advantage of presenting various choices to the user for using the invention (Abbott, paragraph [0054]).

16. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034799 (Mikami) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.).

For **Claim 23**, Mikami teaches: "The method of claim 21."

Mikami discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...further comprising re-loading at least one instance of the portal in response to a change to the shared portal configuration."

With respect to Claim 23, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...the shared portal configuration re-loads within the portal when a change occurs to the shared portal configuration" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Mikami because both inventions are directed towards profiles and online applications.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami's invention because both inventions use profiles and online applications. Mikami (as modified by Cook) discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising parent and child profiles. However Mikami does not expressly disclose re-loading an instance of the portal in response to a change to the shared portal configuration. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views (Hayes, paragraph [0062]).

17. Claims 18, 25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034799 (Mikami) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,397 (Sheppard).

For **Claim 18**, Mikami teaches: “The system of claim 16.”

Mikami discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: “the intelligence comprises one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression or a neural network.”

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches: “the intelligence comprises one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression or a neural network” [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Mikami because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami’s invention because both inventions use computers. Mikami discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising parent and child profiles. However, Mikami does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of finding parents of a child profile.

For **Claim 25**, Mikami teaches: “The system of claim 21, further comprising.”

Mikami discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: “employing one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression or a neural network to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration.”

With respect to Claim 25, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches: “employing one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression or a neural network to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration” [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Mikami because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami’s invention because both inventions use computers. Mikami discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users (title) comprising parent and child profiles. However, Mikami does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data

analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of finding parents of a child profile.

For **Claim 32**, Mikami teaches: “The method of claim 26, further comprising.”

Mikami discloses the above limitations but does not explicitly teach:

- “...employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference, Bayesian learning, a Bayesian classifier, decision tree learning, a support vector machine, a linear regression, a non-linear regression or a neural network to facilitate customization.”

With respect to Claim 23, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches:

- “...employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference, Bayesian learning, a Bayesian classifier, decision tree learning, a support vector machine, a linear regression, a non-linear regression or a neural network to facilitate customization” [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Mikami because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard’s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Mikami’s invention because both inventions use computers. Mikami discloses a network system allowing the sharing of user profile information among network users

(title) comprising parent and child profiles. However, Mikami does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Mikami, thereby offering the obvious advantage of finding parents of a child profile.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10am-6:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BRENT STACE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2161